



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/810,267	03/26/2004	Andrew Kapochunas	384.7817USU	8528
7590 08/09/2007				
Paul D. Greeley, Esq. Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P. 10th Floor One Landmark Square Stamford, CT 06901-2682			EXAMINER PARDO, THUY N	
			ART UNIT 2168	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,267

Applicant(s)

KAPOCHUNAS ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy N. Pardo

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on May 15, 2007 in response to Examiner's Office action has been reviewed. Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 12 and 20 are independent claims. This Office Action is Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Clark et al. (Hereinafter "Clark") US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0153663, in view of Monteverde US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088553.

As to claim 1, Clark teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising: receiving at least one input address [obtain street address information, 10 of fig. 1; 0040; comparing said at least one input address to at least one standard [compare to old street address or a reference address, 12 of fig. 1; 22-80 of fig. 2; 0041].

However, Clark does not explicitly teach providing a single best address derived from said at least one input address based on said comparison although it has the same functionality of performing updating address file based on the addresses comparison [84 of fig. 2]. Monteverde

Art Unit: 2165

teaches providing a single best address derived from said at least one input address based on said comparison [determine the best site(s) based on the “search term” matches and then display it to the user, see the abstract; 6 of fig. 2; 13 of fig. 3; 21 of fig. 5; 0036].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Data Processing art at the time of the invention to add the feature of Monteverde for comparing each Internet site (i.e., address) with a “search term” (i.e., standard or criteria) to provide the best Internet site address to Clark’s system of providing a new address (updated address) based on all information of both addresses- current address and “change to” address. The motivation being to expand and enhance the versatility of Clark’s system to provide the best accurate address based on the comparison.

As to claim 2, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches matching said single best address to a database having unique business identifiers associated with addresses to find a matching address and providing said matching address [0032-0034; 0043].

As to claim 3, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said database is an advanced office system (AOS) [0041].

As to claim 4, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches providing a match project analysis report [0290; 0296; 0301].

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 5, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches converting said at least one input address to a predetermined record layout, before comparing said input address to said at least one standard [30-80 of fig. 2].

As to claim 6, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches associating said at least one input address with at least one code, said code being used to determine said single best address [0051-0081; 0094-0103].

As to claim 7, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches associating said at least one input address with at least one score, said score being used to determine said single best address [0222-0223; fig. 19-15].

As to claim 8, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said at least one standard is at least one selected from the group consisting of: ZIP+4 coding, coding accuracy support system (CASS), Locatable Address Conversion System (LACS), delivery sequence file (DSF), and National Change of Address (NCOA) [0041-0042].

As to claim 13, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches a matcher for attempting to match any address in said output file or said invalid records to a matching address in a database having unique business identifiers associated with addresses [0023-0030].

As to claim 14, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches an investigator for investigating any address not matched, upon request [0031; 0036].

As to claim 15, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said pre-auditor calculates a plurality of counts associated with said input address file [0010; 0031].

As to claim 16, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said input address file includes a plurality of records and each record includes a plurality of fields [0088-0216].

As to claim 17, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said count is at least one selected from the group consisting of: a number of distinct values by field, a missing field count, a total number of records, and a percent of distinct values [missing field count, 0129-0136; 0150-0153].

As to claim 18, Clark and Monteverde teach the invention substantially as claimed. Clark further teaches that said view is at least one selected from the group consisting of: alphabetical, most frequent content, and alpha characters only [0032-0034; 0036].

As to claims 9, 10-12 and 19-21, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on May 15, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the combination of Clark and Monteverde fails to render claim 1 obvious because neither Clark nor Monteverde teach a method for data cleansing.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner believes that Clark teaches data cleansing by replacing all old addresses by a new updated address [see 20-84 of fig. 2] and Monteverde also teaches cleansing data by providing the best Internet site address from all Internet site addresses [determine the best site(s) based on the "search term" matches and then display it to the user, see the abstract; 6 of fig. 2; 13 of fig. 3; 21 of fig. 5; 0036]. Examiner believes that processes in Clark and Monteverde's systems are processes of cleansing data to provide the most updated data as an address to the user. Furthermore, the recitation "data cleansing" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy N. Pardo whose telephone number is 571-272-4082. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 571-272-4146. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2165

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

August 04, 2007

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thuy Pardo', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

THUY PARDO
PRIMARY EXAMINER